

REMARKS

An obvious typographical error in claim 12 has been corrected. It is therefore believed that all of claims 11-20 should be examined in accordance with the restriction requirement in this case.

The statement of the restriction requirement on page 4 of the Office Action is inconsistent with the Office Action of February 23, 2004. It has been assumed that the Examiner intended to indicate only claims 1-10 were being withdrawn. The current Office Action indicates that claims have been withdrawn from consideration because there is no allowable generic or linking claim. As pointed out in the previous amendment, claim 1 is generic. Since this claim has not been examined, the conclusion that it is not "allowable" has not been established. Examination of all claims is respectfully solicited.

Examined claims were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103 over Thary in view of Wingert. Based on the restriction requirement, this rejection has been interpreted as being applicable to claims 11-20. The rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claim 11 calls for a doll head having a surface and comprising a foam insert, a doll body, and a mesh coupled to the surface of the doll head, wherein the doll head is coupled to the doll body by stitches which extend through the mesh. Claim 20 is directed to a process for attaching the doll head to the doll body including, *inter alia*, sewing part of the doll body to the doll head by passing stitches through the part, the skinned outer surface of the doll head, the foam insert and the woven material. This construction, as well as the method by which it is realized, is not taught or suggested by the references.

The Thary reference shows a dolls head including a foam, and doll body. While the Office Action avers that this reference shows a mesh designated as 38, 40, it is respectfully pointed out that 38 and 40 constitute a warp yarn and a woof yarn rather than a mesh. As shown in Figures 1 and 2, the doll head and the doll body constitute a unitary

structure and there is no need or reason, therefore, to attach the head to the body.

The Wingert reference shows a doll created by taking a stocking which is then cut and the cut edges secured together by suitable stitching. There is no teaching or suggestion of extending the stitches through any type of a mesh.

Before any two references can be combined, there must be a reason or motivation to do so. It is respectfully submitted that there is no such teaching or motivation in the instant case and the combination is clearly the result of hindsight. As pointed out above, the Thary construction does not have a separate head and body and there is, accordingly, no reason to use stitches to combine the head and the body.

In light of all of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that this application is now in condition to be allowed and the early issuance of a Notice of Allowance is respectfully solicited.

Dated: July 7, 2004

Respectfully submitted,

By 

Edward A. Meilman

Registration No.: 24,735

DICKSTEIN SHAPIRO MORIN &
OSHINSKY LLP

1177 Avenue of the Americas
41st Floor

New York, New York 10036-2714

Application No.: 08/737,633

Docket No.: I0717.0003/0US0

(212) 835-1400

Attorney for Applicant